

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

ARTHUR BRIDGES,

Petitioner,

Case Number: 1:09-cv-11665
Honorable Thomas L. Ludington

v.

BLAINE LAFLER,

Respondent.

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

Habeas petitioner Arthur Bridges challenges his convictions for one count of conspiracy to deliver cocaine, Mich. Comp. Laws § 333.741(2)(a)(iv), and one count of possession with intent to deliver cocaine, Mich. Comp. Laws § 750.157a. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, Bridges has filed a Motion for Appointment of Counsel.

Bridges has not suggested any particular reason for seeking counsel, and he has no absolute right to be represented on federal habeas corpus review. *See Abdur-Rahman v. Michigan Dept. of Corrections*, 65 F.3d 489, 492 (6th Cir. 1995); *see also Wright v. West*, 505 U.S. 277, 293 (1992) (citing *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987)). “[A]ppointment of counsel in a civil case is . . . a matter within the discretion of the court. It is a privilege and not a right.” *Childs v. Pellegrin*, 822 F.2d 1382, 1384 (6th Cir. 1987) (internal quotation omitted). A habeas petitioner may obtain representation at any stage of the case “[w]henever the United States magistrate or the court determines that the interests of justice so require.” 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B). The Court determines that the interests of justice do not require appointment of counsel here.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Bridges's Motion for Appointment of Counsel, ECF No. 27, is **DENIED**.

Dated: December 16, 2013

s/Thomas L. Ludington
THOMAS L. LUDINGTON
United States District Judge

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail, and upon Arthur Bridges # 154318, 10274 Boyer Rd, Carson City, MI 48811 by first class U.S. mail on December 16, 2013.

s/Tracy A. Jacobs
TRACY A. JACOBS